

David C. Reymann (8495)
Kade N. Olsen (17775)
PARR BROWN GEE & LOVELESS, P.C.
101 South 200 East, Suite 700
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
(801) 257-7939
dreymann@parrbrown.com
kolsen@parrbrown.com

Steven P. Lehotsky*
Scott A. Keller*
Jeremy Evan Maltz*
LEHOTSKY KELLER COHN LLP
200 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20001
(512) 693-8350
steve@lkcfirm.com
scott@lkcfirm.com
jeremy@lkcfirm.com
*(admitted pro hac vice)

Todd Disher*
Joshua P. Morrow*
Alexis Swartz*
LEHOTSKY KELLER COHN LLP
408 W. 11th Street, 5th Floor
Austin, TX 78701
(512) 693-8350
todd@lkcfirm.com
josh@lkcfirm.com
alexis@lkcfirm.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff NetChoice, LLC

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF UTAH**

NETCHOICE, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

**SEAN D. REYES, in his official
capacity as Attorney General of Utah,**

**KATHERINE HASS, in her official
capacity as Director of the Division of
Consumer Protection of the Utah
Department of Commerce,**

Defendants.

**JOINT MOTION TO STAY
PROCEEDINGS PENDING APPEAL**

Case No. 2:23-cv-00911-RJS-CMR

Judge Robert J. Shelby

Magistrate Judge Cecilia M. Romero

Plaintiff (NetChoice, LLC) and Defendants (Sean D. Reyes and Katherine Hass, in their official capacities) respectfully move to stay all proceedings in this Court while Defendants appeal the Court's order preliminarily enjoining Defendants' enforcement of The Utah Minor Protection in Social Media Act. ECF 86. A stay of proceedings would serve the interest of justice and would protect efficiencies of time and effort for the Court, for counsel, and for the Parties.

The "power to stay proceedings is incidental to the power inherent in every court to control the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants." *Landis v. North American Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936). "It is well settled that the district court has the power to stay proceedings pending before it and to control its docket for the purpose of economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants." *Baca v. Berry*, 806 F.3d 1262, 1269-70 (10th Cir. 2015) (cleaned up).

The Parties agree that a stay of proceedings is warranted here because it would serve judicial economy to allow the Tenth Circuit to resolve the legal issues now on appeal before the case goes further in this Court. Nor would a stay prejudice either party. There are no motions pending in this Court, nor have the Parties conducted a Rule 26(f) conference. Rather, a stay would prevent the parties from having to conduct inefficient dual-track litigation in both this Court and the Tenth Circuit.

Accordingly, the parties respectfully request the Court stay proceedings in this Court while Defendants appeal the Court's preliminary-injunction order.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 17th day of October.

PARR BROWN GEE & LOVELESS, P.C.

/s/ Lance Sorenson

Lance Sorenson

David Wolf

ASSISTANT UTAH ATTORNEYS GENERAL

Counsel for the Defendants

/s/ David C. Reymann

David C. Reymann

Kade N. Olsen

LEHOTSKY KELLER COHN LLP

Steven P. Lehotsky

Scott A. Keller

Todd Disher

Jeremy Evan Maltz

Joshua P. Morrow

Alexis Swartz

Attorneys for Plaintiff NetChoice, LLC

Certificate of Service

I, Jeremy Evan Maltz, certify that on October 17, 2024, the foregoing was filed electronically via the Court's CM/ECF system.

/s/ Jeremy Evan Maltz
Jeremy Evan Maltz